

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated October 19, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on January 19, 2007. Applicants submit this response to place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-24 and 26-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 6, 11, 17 and 20-21 have been amended to incorporate limitations from dependent claims 5, 8, 13, 19, and 24, respectively, which are canceled herein. Accordingly, Applicants submit these amendments do not introduce new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-24 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,940,821 to *Wical*. Claims 5, 8, 13 and 19 have been canceled, as their limitations have been incorporated into corresponding independent claims. Regarding the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In this case, *Wical* fails to teach each and every element as set forth in the claims.

For example, regarding independent claims 1, 6 and 17, there is no teaching whatsoever of a user-specified level of expansion, an interface allowing a user to specify the level of expansion, or an interface that allows a user to specify different sets

of expanded search terms associated with different levels of expansion, as recited in these claims.

In rejecting original claim 5 (whose limitation has been incorporated into claim 1), the Examiner refers to portions of *Wical* (col. 15 lines 1-6) as disclosing a user-specified level of expansion. In rejecting original claim 8 (whose limitation has been incorporated into claim 6), the Examiner refers to portions of *Wical* (col. 32 lines 38-43, col. 15 lines 1-6, and FIG. 6) as “disclosing an interface allowing a user to specify the level of expansion associated with the base term.” In rejecting original claim 19 (whose limitation has been incorporated into claim 17), the Examiner refers to portions of *Wical* (FIG. 14 and col. 14, lines 38-55) as disclosing an interface “that allows a user to specify different sets of expanded search terms associated with different levels of expansion.”

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that col. 32 lines 38-43 provide only a generic description of a computer system I/O interface, that col. 15 lines 1-6 provide only a generic description of how to expand terms via categories, and that col. 14 lines 38-55 provide only a description of a distance weight algorithm used in expanding terms. None of these sections, however, even given the broadest possible interpretation, comes close to teaching *a user-specified level of expansion OR an interface allowing a user to specify a level of expansion*, as recited in the claims.

Accordingly, Applicants submit claims 1, 6, and 17, as well as their dependents, are allowable and request withdrawal of this rejection with respect to these claims.

Regarding independent claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit that *Wical* fails to teach that a “different one or more expanded search terms are obtained for the at least one base search term depending on the name of the field,” as recited in the claim. As described in the present specification, having the one or more expanded search terms depend on a name of the field, allows different search terms to be used depending on in which field the term shows is used. As illustrated in the example provided in paragraph

[0069] of the present application, this allows a common search term, such as "IN" to retrieve state names for Indiana, if the term appears in a geographic field or a set of genes if the term appears in a gene related field.

In rejecting original claim 13 (whose limitation has been incorporated into claim 11), the Examiner refers to portions of *Wical* (col. 12 lines 1-15 and FIGs. 8A-8C), as disclosing this limitation. However, Applicants respectfully submit that this cited portion teaches how a search term may be associated with different categories, however, it does not teach how "different one or more expanded search terms are obtained for the at least one base search term depending on the name of the field," as recited in the claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit claim 11, as well as its dependents, are allowable and request withdrawal of this rejection with respect to these claims.

Regarding independent claim 21, Applicants respectfully submit that *Wical* fails to teach *a single repository containing different sets of expanded search terms associated with the same base term*, as recited in the claim. In rejecting previously presented claim 24, the Examiner refers to portions of *Wical* (Col14 lines 25-37 and FIGs 8A-C), as disclosing this limitation. However, Applicants respectfully submit that these cited portions teach links between categories and terminology, they fail to teach *a single repository containing different sets of expanded search terms associated with the same base term*.

Accordingly, Applicants submit claim 21, as well as its dependents, are allowable and request withdrawal of this rejection with respect to these claims.

Regarding independent claim 28, Applicants respectfully submit that *Wical* fails to teach the generation or use of a pointer to a set of expanded search terms or the use of such a pointer to retrieve the expanded search terms in order to modify the query, as recited in the claim. In rejecting claim 28, the Examiner refers to portions of *Wical* (FIGs. 6, 7, 9C, col. 14 lines 27-55, col. 11 lines 42-44, and col. 17 lines 62-65), as

PATENT

App. Ser. No.: 10/691,308

Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920030320US1

PS Ref. No.: IBMK30320

disclosing this limitation. However, Applicants respectfully submit that these cited portions teach links between categories and terminology, they fail to teach the actual generation of a pointer, or use thereof, as recited in the claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit claim 28, as well as its dependents, are allowable and request withdrawal of this rejection with respect to these claims.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

If the Examiner believes any issues remain that prevent this application from going to issue, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact Gero McClellan, attorney of record, at (336) 643-3065, to discuss strategies for moving prosecution forward toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43,876
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants